



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,120	05/31/2007	Michel Bruel	4717-36800	7416
28765	7590	07/06/2011	EXAMINER	
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP PATENT DEPARTMENT 1700 K STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20006				KHARE, ATUL P
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1742				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/06/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@winston.com
mwalker@winston.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/574,120	BRUEL, MICHEL	

Examiner	Art Unit	
ATUL P. KHARE	1742	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) ATUL P. KHARE. (3) _____.

(2) Allan A. Fanucci (Applicant's Representative). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 June 2011

Time: 12:00 PM

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

34-53

Prior art documents discussed:

Morceau (WO 99/35674), Haberger (US 6417075)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Christina Johnson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1742
/ATUL P. KHARE/
Examiner, Art Unit 1742

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner and Applicant's Representative discussed the newly proposed claims, some of which are substantially identical to the original set of examined claims. Applicant's Representative pointed to portions of the instant specification which provide support for new limitations which have been presented in the dependent claims (such as in claim 40). Applicant's Representative pointed to some deficiencies of the prior art references in meeting the disclosed method. .